

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on July 28, 2008.

Claims 1, 9, 17 and 22 are amended; as a result, claims 1-30 are now pending in this application.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

The final office action rejects claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Eichstadt et al. (U.S. 2003/0023754). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. For reasons explained below, the claims in question are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over the cited reference.

Independent claims 1, 9, 17, 22, 26 and 29 are respectfully asserted to distinguish over Eichstadt.

Eichstadt describes a method and system for adding real-time, interactive functionality to a web-page or HTML document that enables interaction between and among a plurality of users viewing the same web-page. In contrast, independent claims 1, 9, 17, 22, 26 and 29 describe a method for executing a requested component of a script at the client.

Eichstadt in paragraph [0009] describes about “insert the script code (or a reference or pointer to the script code), and transmits the modified web page including the inserted script code to one or more users who requested the web-page” at the server. In contrast, presently amended independent claims 1, 9, 17 and 22 recite “transmitting parameter information about a requested component from a server to a client, wherein the parameter information comprises at least one of specific information about user interfaces, set of field names and types, and linking and interrelationship information”. Support for this can be found in page 5 lines 12-21. Further, Eichstadt **does not** teach or suggest “linking the transmitted component parameter information to a predefined structure at the client to provide a script specific predefined structure, the predefined structure having an intended functionality corresponding to the intended functionality of the requested component”, as recited in amended independent claims 1, 9, 17 and 22. Support for this can be found in page 5, lines 21-28.

Eichstadt describes inserting the script code into the web page **at the server** and transmitting the modified web page to the client, whereas amended independent claims 1, 9, 17 and 22, and independent claims 26 and 29 describe transmitting the parameter information to the

client and linking the parameter information or component script to a predefined structure **at the client** to provide a script specific predefined structure. By transmitting only the parameter information in script format, much network bandwidth is saved as compared to sending the entire script, which includes the basic structure of the application.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims 1-30 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney to facilitate prosecution of this application.


Respectfully submitted,

MURALIDHARAN LAKSHMINARASIMHAN KANCHI

By his Representatives,

Global IP Services, PLLC,
198 F, 27th Cross, 3rd Block,
Jayanagar, Bangalore 560 011
INDIA

Phone: 603-888-7958



Date September 29, 2008

By _____
Prakash Nama
Reg. No. 44, 255